

Appl. No. : 09/787,784
Filed : July 30, 2001

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 9-30. Reconsideration and allowance of all Claims 9-30 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,751,733 to Delayaye, et al (Delayaye) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,557,765 to Lipner, et al (Lipner).

Delayaye discloses a system which repeatedly enciphers a digital word under the control of a key. (See Column 1 Lines 54-62). According to the system, portions of the input word are scrambled in a permutation circuit. Each resulting portion is used as an address in a memory so as to map the scrambled input into a second word. The process of scramble and map repeats a number of times, after which a final scramble occurs. The result is an enciphered word which can be deciphered back to the input word with knowledge of the enciphering algorithm.

Lipner discloses a system for allowing access to stored data to only authorized users. The decrypting user acquires a key for decrypting the stored data either by negotiating the key with the encrypting user (See Column 13 Lines 13-20) or by complying with a set of access rules (See Column 29, Lines 33-42).

The combination of the Delayaye and Lipner systems does not, however, include all of the limitations of Applicants Claims 9, and 27-28. For example, the combination does not have a receiver configured to receive a data block comprising an encrypted first encrypted part and a remaining encrypted part, the first encrypted part carrying information for decryption of the remaining encrypted part such that the remaining encrypted part can be decrypted only after decrypting the first encrypted part. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9, and 27-28 overcome the combination, and is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, as Claims 10-17 each depend from Claim 9, applicant respectfully submits that Claims 10-17 are also in condition for allowance.

Similarly the combination does not include all of the limitations of Applicants Claims 18, and 29-30. For example, the combination does not disclose a method comprising encrypting data

Appl. No. : 09/787,784
Filed : July 30, 2001

for an intended recipient configured to receive an encrypted first encrypted part and a remaining encrypted part, the first encrypted part carrying information for decryption of the remaining encrypted part such that the remaining encrypted part can be decrypted only after decrypting the first encrypted part. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Claims 18, and 29-30 overcome the combination, and is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, as Claims 19-26 each depend from Claim 18 and have their own unique features, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 19-26 are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of these amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 7/24/06

By: 

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

2706694
062306